DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 359 UD 013 935

AUTHOR Berger, Alan S.; And Others
TITLE Black Families and the Moynihan Report: A Research Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE 28 Aug 73
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the American Sociological Association annual meeting, New York, N. Y., August 28, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Aspiration; *Caucasians; Educational Quality; Employment Patterns; Family Influence; *Family Life; Lower Class; *Negroes; Race; Racial Differences; Role Perception; Self Concept; Sex (Characteristics); Social Class; *Socialization; Socially Deviant Behavior; Stereotypes; Surveys; Youth
IDENTIFIERS Illinois; *Moynihan Report

ABSTRACT

The Moynihan Report requires the black family to socialize children very differently from the way that the white family does. It thus produces more antisocial behavior, ineffective education, and lower levels of occupational attainment. The present study employs data collected from a random sample of the 14-18 year old population of Illinois and examines the joint effects of race, gender, social class, and family organization on a number of indicators of family interaction, antisocial behavior patterns, educational aspirations, and gender role conceptions. The conclusions of the Moynihan Report are not supported by these data. There are few differences found in the ways that families treat their children, and these differences are not concentrated in the lower class. Even in the lower class broken family, there is no indication in the data that black families are dramatically different from white families. Thus, in terms of delinquency, educational expectation, perceptions of the education desired by the parents, self conceptions, and notions of appropriate gender role behavior of adults, it was found that empirical evidence provides less than adequate support for the conclusions reached by the Moynihan Report. (Authors/RJ)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083359

BLACK FAMILIES AND THE MOYNIHAN REPORT: A RESEARCH EVALUATION

Alan S. Berger

William Simon

Calvert Cottrell

Logan Green

Mina Hohlen

The Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago

A Paper presented at the 68th Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, New York, August 28, 1973.

Research reported herein was supported, in part, by grants A-70-52R, 2-09-25-0410-02,03.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 013935

ABSTRACT

The Moynihan Report requires the Black family to socialize children very differently from the way that the White family socializes children. It thus produces more antisocial behavior, ineffective educations, and lower levels of occupational attainment.

The current study employs data collected from a random sample of the 14-18 year old population of Illinois and examines the joint effects of race, gender, social class, and family organization on a number of indicators of family interaction, antisocial behavior patterns, educational aspirations, and gender role conceptions.

The conclusions of the Moynihan report are not supported by the data. We find that there are few differences in the ways that families treat their children, and that these differences are not concentrated in the lower class. Even in the lower class broken family, we find no indication in the data that Black families are dramatically different from White families.

Thus, in terms of delinquency, educational expectations, perceptions of the education desired by the parents, self conceptions, and notions of appropriate gender role behavior of adults, we find that the empirical evidence provides less than adequate support for the conclusions of the Moynihan report.

Introduction:

In times of stress, governments often turn to "experts" to provide information which will permit the development of a policy which will ameliorate the stress. Many times, particularly when the stress is purely political, it is hoped that the expert information will prove sufficiently controversial that the stress which generated the need for the development of a policy will be submerged in a discussion of the expert recommendations. Thus, the history of government reports which have employed "expert" data -- at least in the social sciences -- has been a very sorry story. The Kerner commission, the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future are notable recent examples.

The Moynihan report is also an example. While compiled by a single expert within the government (and his staff) the report has generated a great range of controversy and while a number of policies have appeared to flow from this report -- and while the avoidance of policy does not seem to have motivated its writing (quite the opposite) -- the report has generated more heat than light.

One of the reasons for this sorry turn of events we feel lies in the nature of the data used by Moynihan to reach his conclusions. In this paper we want to examine some survey data which, while not collected for the purpose of analyzing family structures, do lend themselves to such an analysis.

We shall focus on what Moynihan called "The Tangle of Pathology." Although Moynihan had specific problems in mind, the controversy that has flowed from his analysis has seemed to generalize to the extent that it now seems part of the conventional wisdom to summarize his finding roughly as follows:

1) The history of Blacks in the United States has been such that slavery has produced a matrifocal family pattern, especially in the lower class.

2) The matrifocal family, caused by low rates of employment and high rates of illegitimacy, lead to unstable family life -- again, mainly in the lower class.

3) This unstable lower class Black family is productive of a variety of socially undesirable behaviors summarized as the tangle of pathology, which is unique to the lower class Black population.

We want to make it clear that this characterization of the Moynihan thesis is undoubtedly an oversimplification of what Moynihan meant. But despite the additional conceptual richness and complexity that can be found in Moynihan's thinking, this is essentially the version which is used in public discourse, including policy and decision making discourse.

Moynihan, in the Department of Labor, utilized a variety of social indicators to arrive at this conclusion: rates of unemployment, illegitimate births, and female headed households. But his data, due to its source, could not be directly analyzed to examine the joint effects of race, class, family organization and measures of "pathology".

Since our data is from a single survey, it is amenable to such an analysis, though of course there are problems of operationalizing measures and so forth.

Data

The data we will use comes from a probability sample of the 14-18 year old population of Illinois. Conducted in late 1971 and early 1972, we obtained a 75%+ completion rate with a 45 minute, self-administered questionnaire. There were slightly more than 3,100 completed and usable questionnaires in the study, and when we compare the results with the census information we find that our sample closely matches the demographic characteristics of the adolescent population of the state. In addition, several items (specifically rates

of sexual intercourse and marijuana use) have appeared in recent national studies and are approximately the same as the results we obtained. Thus we have considerable faith in the generalizability of the results we get in our analyses.

Moynihan's concern with the tangle of pathology seems to be centered around illegitimacy, female headed families (at least a partially male chauvinist attitude?), and unemployment rates. That this is not his sole concern, however, is shown by the following quotation from Page 30 of his report:

> In a word, most Negro youth are in danger of being caught up in the tangle of pathology that affects their world, and probably a majority are so entrapped. . . .(emphasis added)
>
> Obviously, not every instance of social pathology afflicting the Negro community can be traced to the weakness of the family structure. Once or twice removed it will be found to be the principal source of most of the aberrant, inadequate or antisocial behavior that did not establish, but serves to perpetuate, the cycle of poverty and deprivation.
>
> It was by destroying the Negro family under slavery that White America broke the will of the Negro people. Although that will has reasserted itself in our time, it is a resurgence that is doomed to frustration unless the viability of the Negro Family is restored.

In other words, all kinds of inadequate and antisocial behavior is seen as a result of the history of Black slavery, and it is all kinds of aberrant, inadequate and antisocial behavior which compromises the tangle of pathology.

It is probably worth noting at this point that Moynihan's thesis has been interpreted to mean unless the structure of the Black family is changed in such a way as to eliminate it as a cause of "the tangle of Pathology" programs designed to ameliorate the effects of this tangle of pathology are doomed to failure. This line of argument provides the conceptual basis for the dismantling of social welfare programs which do not focus on changing the structure of the family.

In order to test the hypotheses contained in Moynihan's theory we plan to look simultaneously at measures of social class, race, gender, and a variety of measures of "aberrant", "inadequate", and "antisocial behavior"* Because the survey which is providing the data for this analysis is sponsored by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, we have a wealth of data on antisocial behavior, specifically, delinquency. Not only is this an indicator of the nature of the tangle of pathology as Moynihan has made explicit, but it is also the kind of antisocial behavior which is of most concern to the society at large.

We should emphasize that in order for Moynihan's theory to hold, several things are necessary. First, Black rates of antisocial behavior must be higher than those reported by whites of comparable socio-economic status. Secondly, for the instability of the Black family to have a major causal role in antisocial behavior, the adolescents we interviewed in broken homes must have a rate of antisocial behavior which is considerably higher than that reported by respondents in intact families.**

Now it might be argued that even the Blacks in intact homes are subject to the same negative consequences that flow (under the Moynihan theory) from the

---

* We want to make it clear that when we use the terms "aberrant, inadequate, and antisocial behavior" we are using Moynihan's terms. The phrases strike us as a survival from the conceptual framework of the social pathologists of the 1930's. We use it only to be consistant with Moynihan, but are not happy in doing so.

** This almost exclusive concern with the family as a generating cause of delinquency is a kind of curious "family Freudianism" which ignores the effects of other, perhaps even primary, variables such as the social environment. The recent work of Travis Hirschi, among others, indicates clearly that the family cannot be given this importance.

history of slavery and weakened family structure. If this is so, then the Moynihan theory can be supported only by major differences between the races.

In sum, if there is to be empirical verification of the hypotheses included in Moynihan's thesis there must be major and consistant differences between the races, classes, and family structure. Failure to find such a consistent pattern can do nothing but create doubts as to the validity of the causal relationships hypothesized by Moynihan -- or at least by persons who have interpreted (either academically or to policy makers) Moynihan.

In addition, looking at more positive aspects of adolescent behavior, the Moynihan theory would require that lower class Black adolescents have a lower sense of self worth, and competence than do whites of comparable socio-economic status, and that their educational aspirations be lower. It should also be reflected in lower perceptions of parental educational desires, and the friends of Blacks to be doing less well than the friends of the Whites. These statements should, furthermore, hold even more strongly for the Blacks from broken rather than from intact homes. Similarly, family behavior should be radically different in Black and White homes, with White parents being more likely to provide guidance, structure and support when the adolescent comes into conflict with the institutions of the society. In terms of notions about the types of behavior appropriate to persons of each gender, whites should be more likely than Blacks to report wanting to be like their parents, and should in general have a more positive image of at least the father if not both parents than should Blacks. Again, within the Black community those from broken homes should be more negative than those from intact families. With this by way of explanation, let us now turn to an examination of the data to see the extent to which the Moynihan theory can be confirmed.

Since the data is provided via a law enforcement grant, let's begin with a look at the delinquency data. This also provides the strongest test of whether or not rates of antisocial behavior are as postulated by Moynihan.

Figure 1 provides the definitions of the social class and delinquency variables. Table 1* shows the relationships between gender, race, social class, family organization, and the four delinquency measures.

Normal deviance -- which is so named because it is such a normal part of the adolescent experience (though of course the liquor offenses are illegal and, physically, among the most damaging of all drug experiences) -- is far and away the most common. But in all instances where there are enough cases to make comparisons, white adolescents are more involved than are Blacks, and only among the Black males from working class -- note that this is really the respectable working class where Moynihan's theory should not hold -- is there a difference between broken and intact homes.

While not an important indicator of antisocial behavior (except that drinking behavior really is), this table clearly shows that the tangle of pathology argument does not apply any more to Black than to White, and does in addition indicate that the broken home, in any class, race or gender grouping is not highly productive of this form of behavior.

Turning to more serious antisocial behavior -- property crimes -- we again see essentially the same thing. Except among Black females from intact homes --

---

* In this and subsequent tables we show only the lower and working class data. There are no class differences worth reporting. This convention is carried out only in the table presentation, not in the text of the analysis. We do this in the interest of parsimony of presentation.

and not from broken homes as the Moynihan theory would suggest -- there are very few differences in the table, not even class differences, but that is another story.

But again, and now focusing on a serious form of antisocial behavior, we find the expectations generated by the Moynihan report to be contradicted. If property crimes are to be taken as an indication of the impact of the tangle of pathology (and amplified by feelings of alienation, etc.), as I think they must be, then once again this table provides no confirmation of the Moynihan theory.

It is when we turn from property crimes to violent activity, that we see major racial, though not class, differences. Where ever the case base is large enough to support a comparison between the percentages, the Blacks report being at the high end of our violence scale more frequently than the Whites. (Note that the cutting point we are using is between gang fights and carrying a weapon.) However, this table also indicates that the intactness of the family is not related to reports of violent behavior among the Blacks although it is related among the Whites.

This data indicates at best a weak confirmation of Moynihan's hypothesis. First, the lack of class differences indicates that escaping from the deprivations of poverty, etc., is no protection against violence among adolescents. Even in the upper reaches of the class strata, where as Moynihan indicates, the Black family resembles the white family's behavior (Moynihan P 6), Black young males are as violent as in the lower strata of society. The same is true of Whites, of course. And this is what Moynihan said we could expect if the tangle of pathology affected all strata of Black society, not just the lower socio-economic strata.

The table does indicate that, if violence is a measure of the tangle of

pathology, then it is universal throughout the Black adolescent population. But family structure should play some role (as it does among Whites in the working and higher SES categories) according to Moynihan. The fact that family instability is productive of this indicator of "pathology" among Whites but not among Blacks can either indicate that the history of instability affects all Blacks, or it can be evidence that Blacks, regardless of their class position, have at times felt the need to carry weapons in order to defend themselves, and this violence is not an indicator of pathology at all. The data supports both interpretations, but does not permit a choice between them. (Marginal differences in strong arming are less than 10% between blacks and Whites, and given our small (relatively) sample of Blacks we prefer not to make too much of this.)

Parenthetically, we might add that in an analysis which is currently in progress it appears that Black adolescents who have a highly positive relationship with their mothers are considerably less likely than those who have a negative relationship with their mothers to be high on violence (as we have defined it here). This is not true among White adolescents. It thus appears that some of the internal dynamics, though not the structural characteristics, of the Black family can serve as a barrier to violence to a degree not observed among the white families. In this sense the family may be a crucial mechanism for intervention into the "tangle of pathology" as expressed by violence, though due to the nature of the characteristics which are related to violence it is a mechanism which is difficult to operate.

A major type of antisocial behavior which is of concern to the society, in addition to violence is drug abuse. Particularly if the drug being abused is something more than marijuana which appears to be a fairly common drug among our

sample. Our drug typology is defined in Figure 1.

It is immediately obvious that moving behond experimeatal marijuana use is a very rare occurance, and by many commentators has been taken to indicate all of the characteristics of the tangle of pathology. So the fact that the table indicates neither racial, gender, social class nor family structure differences is again indicative of the fact that if there is a tangle of pathology it affects all sectors of the society equally and cannot be attributed to a history of slavery and destruction of the family as postulated by Moynihan.

But as we discussed earlier, the tangle of pathology is supposed to stand for something more than simply the antisocial behavior we have measured through our delinquency indices. It should also be indicated by inadequate behavior which reinforces the cycle of poverty and deprivation. Despite the recent work of Jencks and his associates (Inequality), educational attainment is still generally considered to be one of the major indications of attempts to be socially mobile. Thus behavior and attitudes which foster educational attainment can be utilized as indications that the individual is attempting to perform as the society expects; and if the individual originates in the lower social classes that he (or she) is attempting to follow the American dream and better him/her self. This is clearly not inadequate social behavior, and so we have chosen to examine this portion of the tangle of pathology by looking at the percentages of adolescents who want, actually expect, and think their parents expect them to obtain at least four years of college.

The statement which is most problematic is the amount of education wanted. While it expresses a desire, the question was phrased in terms of liking to get, without the test of reality being imposed.

While there is some fluctuation by family structure among the adolescents we studied, it is not consistent in direction. There is a clear class relationship among the Whites, but not among the Blacks, and the differences between the races are minimal. Indeed, it is only at the upper reaches of the class system that the Black youth would like to get less education than the White youth of the same social class position. Clearly, the normative prescriptions of the society have permeated the Black community at least in this respect, and in terms of what they want there is no evidence of the tangle of pathology.

When we asked the question about educational aspirations but added a reality test by asking what they really expected to obtain, we find that the answers, while indicating a somewhat lower proportion expecting four or more years of college, again show the same pattern. Few differences by family structure, some differences by class, but almost nothing by race.

Even if we look at the differences between what would be liked and what is expected (by subtracting the percentages), we see no major or consistant differences. The major differences do occur among the Blacks, but these occur once among those from intact homes and once among those from broken homes.

In sum, even though the proportions of Blacks who attend college is much lower than the proportions among Whites, the aspiration is still there. And while the failure to realize the aspiration may have negative consequences the tangle of pathology ought to be reflected, especially among 14-18 year olds, in reduced aspirations. It clearly is not.*

---

* Whatever pathogenic qualities may inhere in creating aspirations which are unlikely to be realized among the Black adolescents, society has at least inculcated the aspirations. In contrast, among many white working class youth these aspirations do not even exist. It may be harder to inculcate these aspirations in the latter population than to design programs which will allow the Black adolescents to realize their aspirations. At the very least, the existence of these aspirations provide a potent arguement against "benign neglect" and other policies which concentrate only on family structure variables. cf. Kohn, Class and Conformity for an analysis which supports this line of reasoning.

If it is not reflected among the adolescents themselves, perhaps it can be found in their perceptions of how much education their parents expect them to get. But if anything, the Black adolescents think that their parents are more likely to want them to finish college than are the White adolescents.

So that even when we look at the transmission (or at least the successful transmission -- for that is what a perception of parental desires is) of a central cultural value, we can see that the tangle of pathology does not seem to be a dominant theme.

If we turn to an examination of how these young adults are actually doing in school, how their friends are doing, and how well they think their parents expect them to be doing, we can see that although they perceive their parents as wanting chem to achieve above average competance in school (another indication that cultural norms are being transmitted successfully), Black respondents are less likely than White respondents to report that they and their friends are doing above average.

This, of course, may well be nothing more than a reflection of the well known phenomenon that teachers tend to give higher grades to people who match the well groomed, amenable, middle class stereotype of the good student. It does provide some ground for concern that Black youngsters are more likely than White to have a negative image of the educational system, but by no means does it provide a basis for a discussion of one indicator of the tangle of pathology being "ineffective education".

Thus far we have been looking at manifestations of the tangle of pathology as they are reflected in the behavior of the adolescent with respect to the world outside the family. However, it is a crucial component of the Moynihan theory that the pathological conditions are generated within, and transmitted

by, the family. Presumably this is accomplished by interaction between parents and children in the course of which attitudes are transmitted. And presumably the nature of the interaction itself is part of the process of transmission.

What we would like to do at this point is to examine some aspects of the interaction between the parents and their children to see if, consistant with our earlier argument, there appears to be a different type of interaction that occurs among the Black, lower class broken families which would indicate behavior which would be more conducive to a transmission of socially pathological behavior and/or attitudes.

What kinds of behaviors would we expect that would carry a connotation of these pathologies? Well, we would expect the family to be more autocratic -- simply tell the children what has to be done without explaining the reasons why. We would expect that a behavior pattern which would lead to pathology of the types that Moynihan discusses would involve establishing fewer rules for the children to follow. We would expect that families in which the tangle of pathology is being transmitted would be less likely to engage in a high level of family activity. We would also suspect that families who would be transmitting the tangle of pathology would be families which abandoned their children when these children came into contact with the officials of agencies of the society -- in the case of most adolescents the schools and the police.

We would also suspect that these families would be the families in which the adolescents were the least likely to report a high degree of intimacy or interaction with their parents, and would be the most likely to have the stereotyped images of the roles that it is appropriate for men and women to play in our society.

On the other hand, it should also be pointed out that in many popular or quasi-popular works Moynihan's notions about the critical role of the Black family have been taken over and abused in an oversimplified manner. In many works -- The Unheavenly City serving merely as a convenient example of a genre -- there appears to be an assumption that Black, particularly lower class Black families treat their children sufficiently differently from the way the "rest of us" treat our children that something approaching a "culture of poverty" or at least a cultural milieu or climate which supports illegitimacy, lack of occupational and educational motivation, and lack of a sense of family is communicated.

In this regard, we need only look at the differences in types of family interaction patterns within class, controlling for gender and race, in order to see whether or not family interactions really are different.

To examine the impact of these factors on self images, conceptions of worth, and notions of what is appropriate behavior for adults of each gender, again we need only look at the differences by class controlling for gender and race.

We begin by looking at the pattern of family interaction by class, gender and race. There are ten dimensions of family activity, behavior and interaction which appear as columns in this table. They are defined in Figure 2. If the Moynihan hypothesis is correct we would expect to see a very different pattern of family behavior emerging between the races -- at the very least the races would be different. Of the 72 comparisons between the races which can be made in this table, only 28 show a difference between the races of 10% or more.

Now, regardless of the substance of these differences there simply is not

enough of a consistant pattern of differences in this data to support the notion that the Black family presents a radically different image to its children than the White family presents to its children. If we consider only the lower class, where 20 comparisons are possible, only seven show a difference of 10% or more between the races, again emphasizing the point that the radical differences in family behavior that the Moynihan hypothesis would lead us to believe it is based upon simply is not there in massive enough proportions to be the basis for the kinds of grand theorizing that has emerged from the Moynihan report.*

Similarly, when we intervene family organization in these tables and look at the distributions on the ten measures of family functioning within SES, race and gender (and because of low case bases exclude all comparisons in which the "N" is less than 10 in both family structure categories -- and these tables are not shown), we can make 100 comparisons. Only 40 of these comparisons show differences between broken and intact families of 10% or more. In 24 of the 40 the intact families are higher than the broken, but even more importantly only 15 of the 40 differences occur among Blacks. Once again, strong evidence that the family structure variable is not the one on which we ought properly to base our theorizing.

---

* The genesis of this paper was an early look at the modeling, or "be like" items in which a positive image of the mother is more common among Blacks than among Whites and in which, more strongly, a positive image of the father is much less common among Blacks than among Whites. This, of course tends to support the Moynihan arguement. However, given the fact that in the Black community mothers are often more integrated into the labor force and other aspects of the wider society, this paternal rejection may well be serving the same function for Blacks as did rejection of the family of origin for immigrant groups -- that is, the higher rates of rejection of Black fathers may indicate that the Black children are moving in the direction of accepting models of full participation in society.

If we turn from the area of family interaction and look at self concept variables, we see a somewhat similar pattern. Looking only within gender and class at the racial differences, in only 9 out of 48 comparisons is there a 10% or larger difference. Whites have a better self image in six out of these nine differences, but again, this is precious little on which to hang a theoretical framework. When we add the family structure variable (and again look at only those cases where we have an "N" of at least 10), we can examine 36 comparisons and only 14 have a 10% or more percentage difference, and in virtually all of them the intact family does produce a better self image. But despite this, the paucity of consistant findings between the races within gender and class boundaries leaves the empirical basis of the Moynihan theory in considerable doubt.

Finally, when we turn to the question of the conceptions that adolescents have about behaviors which are appropriate to adults of each gender, we can see that the data again fails to provide an empirical basis for the Moynihan hypothesis. In 40 comparisons between the races, controlling for class and gender, there are 24 which are 10% or more.

On the variable "spouses should share the duties of raising children and being breadwinner", there are eight comparisons, half of which show a 10% difference. In all cases (and half are among males and half among females), it is the Black adolescents who are more likely than the Whites to agree. Perhaps a reflection of the roles that are supposed to have been traditionally played in Black families, but given the high level of agreement among Whites as well as Blacks perhaps simply support for a more companionate or egalitarian form of family structure.

The former interpretation gains a little more support in the analysis of the variable "there ought to be more opportunities for women in our society",

where we find seven comparisons with a 10% or greater difference, all of which show Blacks being more likely than Whites to endorse this statement.

The other gender role variables show a slightly less consistant pattern -- White adolescents apparently less willing than Blacks to accept a woman boss and more willing to say that women naturally want to be taken care of by men, and that girls ought to be agreeable rather than speaking out what is on their mind.

In sum, the gender role items show that Black adolescents are more likely to have a picture of adult behavior in which women ought to play a more active role. But again, this conclusion is based on 24 substantial differences out of 40 comparisons, and thus is a slender reed on which to base theory.

Conclusion

We have looked at a number of indicators of both positive and negative aspects of Moynihan's theoretical formulations. In general our conclusion is that the data simply do not support the conclusions which are generally imputed to Moynihan's work -- namely that the Black family is drastically different from the White family in the way it treats its children and in the results it produces.

There are at least two ways of interpreting this result. One is that the Moynihan report has been a remarkably successful instrument of social policy, and that in the few years since it has appeared, it has succeeded in reversing the way that Black families behave. Another, and more probable interpretation is that there are forces operating in the society which produce the high rates of illegitimacy, unemployment and other antisocial factors which Moynihan reported,

but these are not solely family factors. Just as our research has shown that the broken family is not, in general, the crucial causative factor in juvenile delinquency that it is often taken to be, so too social science will apparently have to seek another "single factor" which causes the problems of the Black community though we doubt that any single factor will provide an adequate explanation.

TABLES TO ACCOMPANY

BLACK FAMILIES AND THE MOYNIHAN REPORT: A RESEARCH EVALUATION

Alan S. Berger

William Simon

Calvert Cottrell

Logan Green

Mina Hohlen

The Institute For Juvenile Research, Chicago

A Paper presented at the 68th Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, New York, August 28, 1973.

Research reported herein was supported, in part, by grants A-70-52R, 2-09-25-0410-02.

TABLE 1

Socio-Economic Status, Gender, Race, Family organization and Delinquencies

SES	Gender	Race	Family Organization	Normal Deviance (% Any)	Theft (%3 or more)	Violence (% 3 or more)	Drugs (% more than Experimental Marijuana
Low	Male	White	Intact	91 (140)	36 (140)	20 (136)	2 (143)
			Broken	91 (54)	40 (52)	18 (53)	3 (53)
		Non White	Intact	77 (43)	40 (43)	43 (43)	5 (42)
			Broken	82 (62)	49 (62)	44 (62)	4 (59)
	Female	White	Intact	83 (152)	21 (148)	11 (152)	7 (152)
			Broken	87 (56)	32 (56)	9 (55)	4 (55)
		Non White	Intact	80 (63)	48 (64)	39 (61)	0 (68)
			Broken	82 (65)	27 (69)	21 (69)	9 (74)
Working	Male	White	Intact	91 (440)	43 (444)	17 (438)	6 (432)
			Broken	95 (42)	60 (42)	32 (42)	5 (37)
		Non White	Intact	69 (46)	39 (50)	49 (50)	7 (49)
			Broken	94 (27)	58 (25)	44 (22)	2 (25)
	Female	White	Intact	89 (426)	32 (426)	11 (427)	6 (421)
			Broken	86 (52)	29 (38)	6 (38)	5 (38)
		Non White	Intact	90 (38)	31 (47)	22 (51)	0 (51)
			Broken	95 (12)	33 (14)	50 (12)	17 (12)
	Low & Working		N =	1718	1720	1711	1711
	Middle & Upper Middle		N =	1000	995	992	981
			N.A. =	394	397	409	420
			Total N =	3112	3112	3112	3112

TABLE 2

SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS, GENDER, RACE, FAMILY ORGANIZATION, AND EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

Class	Gender	Race	Family Organization	Highest Degree Wanted (% 4 Years College +)	Highest Degree Expected (% 4 Years College +)	Highest Degree Wanted by Parents (% 4 Years or More of College)
Low	Male	White	Intact	35 (133)	29 (133)	33 (133)
			Broken	42 (49)	38 (49)	47 (49)
		Non White	Intact	43 (40)	27 (41)	30 (41)
			Broken	48 (49)	42 (51)	34 (50)
	Female	White	Intact	33 (146)	27 (145)	27 (145)
			Broken	31 (49)	30 (49)	26 (49)
		Non White	Intact	49 (60)	31 (60)	34 (58)
			Broken	46 (66)	41 (66)	35 (66)
Working	Male	White	Intact	50 (422)	42 (420)	42 (416)
			Broken	51 (38)	45 (38)	26 (38)
		Non White	Intact	55 (50)	52 (50)	62 (50)
			Broken	82 (27)	61 (27)	71 (27)
	Female	White	Intact	42 (407)	36 (406)	31 (406)
			Broken	52 (37)	37 (37)	38 (37)
		Non White	Intact	52 (50)	51 (50)	43 (50)
			Broken	65 (11)	62 (12)	67 (12)
Low & Working			N =	1634	1634	1627
Middle & Upper Middle			N =	966	962	966
			N.A. =	512	516	519
			Total N =	3112	3112	3112

TABLE 3

SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS, GENDER, RACE, FAMILY ORGANIZATION, AND EDUCATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Class	Gender	Race	Family Organization	(% Above Average) R Doing in School	R's Friends Doing in School	R's Parents Expect R to Do in School
Low	Male	White	Intact	31 (146)	31 (134)	44 (134)
			Broken	31 (54)	34 (48)	43 (50)
		Non White	Intact	19 (41)	23 (41)	42 (39)
			Broken	24 (62)	34 (47)	56 (49)
	Female	White	Intact	36 (152)	37 (146)	39 (145)
			Broken	35 (54)	47 (49)	45 (49)
		Non White	Intact	22 (68)	21 (58)	50 (58)
			Broken	32 (75)	24 (66)	36 (66)
Working	Male	White	Intact	39 (446)	31 (418)	58 (422)
			Broken	38 (41)	23 (38)	39 (38)
		Non White	Intact	23 (51)	16 (47)	56 (48)
			Broken	15 (25)	13 (25)	35 (27)
	Female	White	Intact	47 (431)	36 (407)	49 (407)
			Broken	48 (38)	34 (37)	59 (37)
		Non White	Intact	25 (53)	26 (49)	54 (50)
			Broken	37 (15)	11 (10)	62 (12)
Low & Working			N =	1752	1620	1631
Middle & Upper Middle			N =	1013	966	964
			N.A. =	347	526	517
			Total N =	3112	3112	3112

TABLE 4

Class, Gender, Race and Family Interaction Measures

Class	Gender	Race	Parents Explain Reasons	Family Rules % 2	Family Activity % high	Believe-Defend vs School
Low	Male	White	46 (197)	11 (187)	28 (200)	67 (192)
		Non White	50 (107)	15 (93)	26 (105)	52 (94)
	Female	White	42 (207)	9 (195)	24 (207)	68 (201)
		Non White	47 (143)	17 (137)	13 (141)	55 (127)
Working	Male	White	47 (492)	9 (478)	32 (487)	70 (463)
		Non White	53 (76)	12 (70)	18 (74)	75 (63)
	Female	White	49 (468)	7 (454)	71 (468)	71 (442)
		Non White	44 (70)	13 (66)	24 (63)	55 (62)
Low & Working		N =	1760	1680	1745	1644
Middle & Upper Middle		N =	1011	970	1005	985
		N.A. =	341	462	362	483
		Total N =	3112	3112	3112	3112

TABLE 5

Class, Gender, Race and Self Concept

	Self Satisfied % High	Competent % High	Emotional Problems % Ever
Lower male white	45 (191)	69 (190)	39 (191)
Non white	53 (99)	29 (105)	37 (103)
female white	44 (209)	41 (207)	34 (208)
Non white	30 (139)	33 (138)	32 (141)
Working male white	49 (483)	42 (486)	30 (489)
Non white	50 (74)	35 (74)	24 (72)
female white	46 (464)	45 (462)	34 (468)
Non white	48 (65)	36 (66)	29 (66)
Low & Working N =	1724	1728	1738
Middle & Upper Middle N =	1000	995	1006
N.A. =	388	389	368
Total N =	3112	3112	3112

TABLE 6

CLASS, GENDER, RACE AND GENDER ROLE EXPECTATIONS

Class	Gender	Race	(% Strong Agree and Agree) Spouses Share Duties	Women Want Care	More Opportunities For Women	Not Want Woman Boss	Girls Should Be Agreeable
Low	Male	White	67 (197)	86 (198)	52 (199)	49 (197)	38 (197)
		Non White	73 (106)	74 (104)	62 (104)	48 (100)	48 (104)
	Female	White	74 (205)	82 (203)	58 (205)	43 (201)	30 (205)
		Non White	85 (145)	85 (145)	77 (145)	42 (139)	34 (145)
Working	Male	White	72 (487)	84 (487)	52 (486)	54 (485)	33 (488)
		Non White	85 (78)	73 (78)	75 (78)	37 (78)	40 (78)
	Female	White	80 (446)	86 (465)	63 (466)	40 (467)	23 (463)
		Non White	91 (65)	90 (65)	83 (64)	50 (60)	22 (65)
Low & Working		N =	1729	1745	1747	1727	1745
Middle & Upper Middle		N =	1030	1010	1008	1008	1010
		N.A.=	353	357	357	377	357
		Total N =	3112	3112	3112	3112	3112

Figure 1. - Index Construction

A. The SES Index was created on the basis of the head of the household's occupation and education scores were assigned as follows:

1) Educational Attainment
   less than high school = 1
   high school graduate = 2
   Some college or more = 3

2) Occupation manual, Farm/worker, semi-skilled labor = 1
   Farmer, Foreman, or skilled labor = 2
   clerical, sales, office = 3
   managerial, professional or technical = 4

These two scores were summed. 10% were unemployed and not included in the sum. The final SES index defines catergories as follows:

Low = unemployed plus sum of 2
working = sum of 3 or 4
middle = sum of 5 or 6
upper middle = sum of 7

B. The Delinquency indices are the result of a factor analysis of 36 self reported delinquency items. Clear factors representing theft and violence emerged and in addition we created a drug use typology, and an index of normal deviance. The theft and violence factors form Guttman Scales. These measures, together with the meaning of the categories we present in this paper are shown below.

1. Theft
   a) deliberately damaged property
   b) taken little things
   c) stolen from a store
   d) taken $20
   e) kept or used stolen goods
   f) breaking and entering

The category of the summated index shown in this paper is defined by ever having engaged in 3 or more of these activities.

2. Violence
   a) had fist fight
   b) been in gang fight
   c) carried a weapon
   d) used a weapon
   e) strong armed robbery

The category shown in this paper is defined by ever having done 3 or more of these activities.

3. Normal Deviance
   a) Cheated on an exam
   b) skipped school
   c) drank without permission
   d) bought liquor
   e) got drunk

The category shown in this paper is defined by ever having done any of these activities.

4. Drugs: Use of
   a) marijuana
   b) LSD
   c) herion
   d) downers
   e) speed
   f) if never use marijuana " do you think you might try it someday?"

The category shown in the table reflects only those who have used more than once or twice or any of the other drugs listed.

Figure 2. Typology Construction

1. Parents explain reasons:
   When your parents insist that you do something, do they explain the reason?

2. Parents criticize:
   How often do your parents criticize you or put you down?

3. Family rules:
   Extent of rules in home. Concerning: household chores, weekend curfews, weeknight curfews, homework, approving friends, wearing hair, dressing, cars, whereabouts. (Low=less than three).

4. Family activities:
   Frequency and extent of engagement in the following activities with parents (summed): going to movies, shopping, visiting sports events, and playing games.

5. Believe and Defend re School:
   If you were accused of doing something wrong at school, but you denied it,
   A. Would your parents believe your side of the story?
   B. Would your parents fo to school to defend you?
   Note: "High" = agreement with both A and B.

6. Believe and Defend re Police:
   If you were accused of doing something wrong by the police, but you denied it . . . .
   A and B ai in #5.

7. Father Affect:
   Responses to these items were summed in the direction of agreement
   a) Can you talk freely to your father about personal feelings?
   b) How do you get along with yout father?
   c) My father understands me as I really am.

8. Father Modeling:
   I would like to grow up to be the kind of person my father is:

9. Mother Affect: Analogous to #7

10. Mother Modeling: Analogous to #8

11. Self Satisfaction:
   a. I really enjoy life. (Reflected)
   b. I feel tense most of the time.
   c. I am afraid someone is going to make fun of me.
   d. There are many things about myself I'd like to change.
   Note: "High" refers to a low summated score over the four items.

12. Competence:
    a. I find life an endless series of problem with no solutions in sight.
    b. I sometimes feel that I just cann"t learn.
    c. Everytime I try to get ahead, something stopes me.
    d. People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life.

    Note: "High" refers to a low summated score over the four items.

13. Emotional Problems:

    Have you ever had an emotional problem for which you needed help?

Footnotes for Moynihan Paper

1. Office of Policy Planning and Research, U.S. Department of Labor. The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965. Popularly known as The Moynihan Report, hereafter referenced as Moynihan.

2. Rainwater, Lee, and William C. Yancey. The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy. Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 1967

3. National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, Marihuana: a signal of Misunderstanding. Washington, D.C., 1972. and Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Final Report and Research Papers Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office 1972-1973.

4. Moynihan, Op. Cit. P. 30.

5. As, for example, in the policy of "benign neglect."

6. Travis Hirschi. The Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1962.

7. Moynihan, Op. Cit. P. 6.

8. Christopher Jencks et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the effect of family and School in America. New York, Basic Books, 1972

9. Melvin Kohn. Class and Conformity. Homewood, Illinois. The Dorsey Press. 1969.

10. Edward C. Banfield. The Unheavenly City. Boston, Little Brown, 1968.

Bibliography

Note--this is to reordered in alphabetical order, with all the titles which appear in the footnotes added into the following list.

Rainwater, Lee. "The Crucible of Identity: The Negro Lower-Class Family" Daedalus Vol. 95 #1, 1966.

William C. Hays and Charles H. Mindel. "Extended Kinship Relations in Black and White Families" Journal of Marriage and The Family. 1973.

J. Allen Williams Jr. and Robert Stockton, "Black Family Structures and Functions: An empirical examination of some suggestions made by Billingsley" Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1973

Elizabeth Herzog. "Is there a 'Breakdown' of the Negro Family" Social Work 1966.

Reynolds Farley and Albert I. Hermalin, "Family Stability: A Comparison of Trends Between Blacks and Whites" American Sociological Review Vol. 36, #1. 1971.